



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,917	02/08/2001	Clay H. Fisher	50N3695.01/1582	9084
24272	7590	07/15/2005	EXAMINER	
Gregory J. Koerner Redwood Patent Law 1291 East Hillsdale Boulevard Suite 205 Foster City, CA 94404			VIEAUX, GARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	
DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/781,917

Applicant(s)

FISHER ET AL.

Examiner

Gary C. Vieaux

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on April 25, 2005 has been entered.

### ***Amendment***

In response to the Office Action of February 23, 2005, claims 1-2, 20-22 and 40-41 have been amended.

In response to Applicants' amended claim 2, the Examiner finds the amendment directly addresses and corrects the previous inconsistencies regarding data sources, and therefore, this objection to the claims is hereby withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants' arguments filed April 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 21, Applicants contend that not only does the Steinberg reference (US 6,628,325) explicitly refer to the network computer as a "destination" in figure 1 (Remarks, p. 15 lines 3-4) and that the Steinberg reference is not found to

Art Unit: 2612

teach utilizing the network computer as a data source for sending data to the camera device (Remarks, p. 15 lines 5-6), but also that the data flow described is in the Steinberg reference is in the completely opposite direction to the data flow recited by Applicants (Remarks, p. 15 lines 6-8), and therefore the Steinberg reference teaches

5 away from the claimed invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner agrees with the Applicants that figure 1 of the Steinberg reference denotes the term "destination" in reference to a remote computer (fig. 1, indicator 18), however Steinberg is not only found to teach utilizing the network computer as a data source for sending data to the camera device, but also found to clearly provide a

10 teaching of data being sent from the data source to the imaging device, with this flow of data being in the same direction as that of the instant application, with the basic objective in Steinberg of allowing a digital camera to be connected to one or more types of communication networks for downloading of data to, and receiving of data from a remote destination (col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 17.) Based on these finding within the

15 Steinberg reference of a teaching of data flow from the data source to the imaging device, the Steinberg reference is not found to teach away from the claimed invention as purported by the Applicants.

Applicants also contend that the Sarbadhikari reference (US 5,477,264) does not disclose "performing one or more on-line management procedures regarding said

20 ancillary data files while an active communication path exists from said imaging device to said computer" (Remarks, p. 14 lines 13-16.) The Examiner also respectfully disagrees, as Sarbadhikari is found to teach automatic upstream modification of image

Art Unit: 2612

data and camera performance via ancillary files during the capture and manipulation stages prior to storage (col. 4 lines 40-49), as well as teach the transmission of this information occurring by way of an interconnected computer as the data source (figs. 10 and 11, col. 11 lines 26-31.)

5        Regarding claims 2-20 and 22-41, each depend either directly from or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 21, and thus inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 21, respectively. Consequently, based on their dependence and the foregoing response to arguments relating to claims 1 and 21, the Examiner respectfully stands behind the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 2-20 and 22-41, in the  
10       capacity of their relations to the limitations of independent claims 1 and 21.

Regarding claims 18 and 38, Applicants contend that neither the Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, nor Anderson reference (US 6,177,957) teach a "data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network" as claimed (Remarks, p. 17 lines 1-8.) As claims 18 and 38 inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 and  
15       21, respectively as provided herein, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and stands behind the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 18 and 38.

         Additionally, Applicants further contend that neither the Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, nor Anderson reference teach "performing one or more on-line management procedures for said ancillary data files while an active communication path exists to said computer  
20       in said distributed computer network" as claimed (Remarks, p. 17 lines 8-12.) Again, as claims 18 and 38 inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 21, respectively

as provided herein, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and stands behind the 35  
U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 18 and 38.

Regarding claim 41, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 41  
recites elements and functionality similar to those recited in claim 21, therefore for the  
5 purposes of brevity, the Examiner references all responses in kind from claim 21 to their  
application with claim 41, correspondingly.

Regarding claim 42, Applicants submit that the Steinberg reference (US  
6,006,039), in light of the specification, does not anticipate or make obvious the  
Applicants' invention as provided for by the "means-plus-function" language of the claim  
10 (Remarks, p. 17 line 15 – p. 18 line 9.) The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The language of claim 42 is as follows: "A system for manipulating image data,  
comprising:

means for storing one or more ancillary data files;  
means for capturing said image data;  
15 means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for  
storing to said means for capturing; and  
means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data  
files."

First, the Specification provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files  
20 which includes a service on a distributed computer network like the Internet, a discrete  
electronic device such as a personal computer, or a removable, non-volatile memory  
device such as a flash memory (p. 6 lines 16-20.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg

Art Unit: 2612

reference provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files which also includes a personal computer (fig. 1 indicator 14; col. 3 lines 57-60), as well as a removable, non-volatile memory device (fig. 1 indicator 22; col. 4 lines 1-3.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art

5 element.

Second, the Specification provides means for capturing said image data that includes an electronic camera device (fig. 1 indicator 110; p. 6 lines 25-26.) Equally, the Steinberg reference provides means for capturing said image data that also includes a camera (fig. 1 indicator 10.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner  
10 to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Third, the Specification provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which includes wireless communications (fig. 6 indicator 632), removable storage media (fig. 6 indicator 636), and "any required type of interfaces or connectors (not shown) for  
15 coupling camera device 110 and other electronic devices or entities to thereby support bi-directional communications" (p. 12 lines 1-27.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which also includes wireless communications, removable storage media, and cable (fig. 1 indicators 20, 22, and 38;  
20 col. 3 lines 45-60.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Fourth and finally, the Specification provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files that includes a central processing unit (fig. 3 indicator 344) employed in combining of image data with ancillary data (p. 9 lines 12-29.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files which also includes a processor to execute camera functionality (fig. 4 indicator 122; col. 7 lines 14-19.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Based on the foregoing comparisons, it is demonstrated that each of the claimed limitations are also found within the Steinberg reference, and therefore the rejection to claim 42 is forthwith maintained by the Examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claim 42** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steinberg et al. (US 6,006,039.)

Regarding claim 42, Steinberg teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising: means for storing one or more ancillary data files (fig. 1 indicator 14); means for capturing said image data (fig. 1 indicator 10); means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing



Art Unit: 2612

(fig. 1 indicators 20, 22, and 38); and means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files (fig. 4 indicator 122.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5           The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10           (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15           **Claims 1, 3-17 and 21, 23-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325.)

Regarding claim 1, Sarbadhikari teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising a data source configured to store one or more ancillary data files (fig. 11 indicator 4; col 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a computer (fig. 11 indicator 4), an imaging device configured to capture said image data (fig. 11 indicator 1), and an ancillary data module for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device for manipulating said image data (fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), said ancillary data module performing one or more on-line management procedures regarding ancillary data files while an active communication path exists from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 40-49; col. 7 lines 44-50; col. 9 lines 9-13), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device

Art Unit: 2612

combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 40.) Although Sarbadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, with the functionality of the removable memory card embodiment applied therein (col. 11 lines 26-37), a data source being implemented as a computer in a

5 distributed computer network is not taught.

Nevertheless, Steinberg teaches a similar system for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed (fig. 1 indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a

10 computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of

15 one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

Regarding claim 3, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 3 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data files include at least one of an image template file ('264 - figs. 8 and 9, col. 6 lines 56-59), a text overlay file ('264 - col. 5 line 25-27), an image background file, an

20 Internet webpage file, and a program instruction file ('264 - col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 40.)

Regarding claim 4, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 4 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said

Art Unit: 2612

imaging device includes at least one of a digital still camera device ('264 - col. 5 lines 55-57), a video camera device, and an electronic scanner device.

Regarding claim 5, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 5 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are transferred from said data source to said imaging device ('264 - col. 2 line 50 - col. 3 line 2) by utilizing at least one of a wireless transmission process and a hard-wired transmission process ('264 - fig. 11 indicator 38; col. 11 lines 22-30.) It is also noted that Steinberg teaches transmission of data by means of a wireless transmission process (col. 4 lines 61-65.)

Regarding claim 6, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 6 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module manipulates said image data by combining selected ones of said ancillary data files with said image data to generate new composite data ('264 - col. 10 line 33-39.)

Regarding claim 7, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 7 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device includes at least one of a capture subsystem ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 10) and a control module ('264 - fig. 10 indicators A and B), said control module having at least one of a central processing unit ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 20), a memory ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 32, indicator 31), a viewfinder ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 29), and one or more input/output interfaces ('264 - fig. 10 indicators 21 and 26.)

Regarding claim 8, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 8 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said memory includes at least one of an application software program, an operating system ('264 - col. 7 lines 60-67), said ancillary data module, said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 8 lines 52-58, col. 10 lines 5-6), a display manager, data storage for storing said image data, and one or more camera menus for display upon said viewfinder.

Regarding claim 9, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 9 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more input/output interfaces include at least one of a distributed electronic network interface ('325 fig. 1 indicator 16), a host computer interface ('264 - fig. 11 indicator 34; '325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a printer interface ('325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a wireless communications interface ('325 col. 4 lines 61-65), a user interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 21), and a removable storage media interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 26; '325 fig. 2 indicator 58.)

Regarding claim 10, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 10 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module includes at least one of a download manager for transferring said ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device and analyzing said ancillary data files ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-67), an editing module for combining said one or more ancillary data files with said image data, a data manager for controlling and reorganizing said one or more ancillary data files, and miscellaneous routines that

Art Unit: 2612

include a conversion routine for translating said one or more ancillary data files into a compatible format.

Regarding claim 11, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 11 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files each include a data portion and a corresponding descriptor tag that is analyzed by said ancillary data module to identify, characterize, and categorize a corresponding one of said one or more ancillary data files (col. 4 lines 58-63, col. 7 lines 31-44.)

Regarding claim 12, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 12 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are created by at least one of a system user on a local computer device and a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production equipment ('264 - col. 6 lines 58-63.)

Regarding claim 13, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 13 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said data source is configured to facilitate interactively accessing, manipulating, and downloading said one or more ancillary data files to said imaging device by a system user ('264 - col. 7 lines 38-50.)

Regarding claim 14, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 14 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device establishes an active communication path to said data source (col. 4 lines 44-47), said active communication path being established by at least one of an

automatic connection protocol ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-65, in which detection of the presence of a card and the presence of a connection to a computer are read to be comparable) and a user-initiated connection protocol (col. 4 lines 46-47; fig. 11 via connection of indicator 38.)

5           Regarding claim 15, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 15 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 14 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module performs one or more on-line management procedures while said active communication path is available, said one or more on-line management procedures including at least one of a data source content review ('264 - col. 7 lines 32-  
10 40, 54-57) and an ancillary-data file download procedure ('264 - col. 7 lines 60-65.)

Regarding claim 16, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 16 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module downloads a special instruction file that corresponds to a selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file including information that  
15 instructs said imaging device how to correctly utilize said selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file being formatted as at least one of an embedded instruction file that is embedded in said selected ancillary data file ('264 - col. 10 lines 43-50) and a discrete instruction file that is not embedded in said selected ancillary data file (col. 9 line 51 – col. 10 line 18.)

20           Regarding claim 17, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 17 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device terminates said active communication path to said data source

Art Unit: 2612

when said on-line management procedures have been completed, said active communication path being terminated by at least one of an automatic termination protocol and a user-initiated termination protocol ('264 - fig. 3, col. 9 lines 3-14, in which an analogous process would apply to a tethered data source instead of an inserted

5 card.)

Regarding claims 21, 23-37, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 1, 3-17, respectively, as discussed above.

**Claims 2 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
10 over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Regarding claim 2, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 2 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), except for explicitly teaching a system wherein said data source includes an image station site on an Internet network.

15 Nevertheless, Official Notice is taken regarding the equivalency of a computer in a distributed computer network and an image station site on an Internet network; concepts and equivalencies that are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the computer in a distributed computer network to be an image station on an Internet  
20 network for the purposes of having a dedicated general purpose computer employed for exclusive image/camera related tasks such as manipulating image data, and which can be accessed via remote locations connected throughout the world wide web or an

equivalent distributed network for the sole purpose of manipulating image data. (It is also noted that Applicants define the Internet as a distributed network (see Abstract.))

Regarding claim 22, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 22 as discussed above.

5

**Claims 18-20, 38-40, and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Anderson (US 6,177,957.)

Regarding claim 18, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 18 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 17 supra), except for teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module performs an off-line management procedure for said one or more ancillary data files that have been downloaded from said data source, said off-line management procedure including a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module categorizes said one or more ancillary data files, said imaging device responsively updating camera menus to include said one or more ancillary data files to thereby enable a system user to utilize said one or more ancillary data files. It is noted that Sarbadhikari does teach on-line management of ancillary data files, in that the identified files may be selectable chosen by the user when connected to the data source (col. 4 lines 40-47; col. 7 lines 38-47.)

20        Nevertheless, Anderson is found to teach dynamically updating software driven features in an electronic imaging device, in which the user may supplement the baseline application programming of the imaging device (col. 2 lines 18-25.) The system of



Art Unit: 2612

Anderson provides a procedure for updating of camera menus to reflect the addition of one or more ancillary data files, thereby enabling a system user to utilize one or more of the ancillary data files, (col. 8 line - col. 9 line 19.) The procedure of Anderson further teaches a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module

5 categorizes said one or more ancillary data files (figs. 7 and 8; col. 8 line 1 – col. 9 line 19.) Although Anderson employs hot mounted files, Anderson demonstrates a teaching of a menu reorganization procedure for files made accessible to the imaging device.

When taken in light of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which includes ancillary data files selected and downloaded to the imaging device from a

10 computer in a distributed computer network, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to add the functionality of a user accessible menu which was appropriately updated to reflect the newly added software

enhancements available, so that the user may fully utilize all the imaging device's available functionality. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

15 art at the time of the invention to employ a file descriptor identification procedure similar to that taught by Anderson, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to correctly identify and implement the ancillary data files, and their corresponding functionality, which have been added to increase the available functionality of the

imaging device, based on the selected files previously added via download from a

20 computer in a distributed computer network. As to the occurrence of the procedure taught above, in conjunction with a teaching by Anderson of the procedure occurring within the imaging device (fig. 8), it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2612

skill in the art that the procedure of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson be performed off-line, so that once the selected files had been downloaded, the imaging device is free to operate as a physically autonomous device, having no further need to be tethered or on-line with the computer, and free to perform  
5 the procedure at locations other than those accessible to the computer and at times when on-line accessibility is limited or no longer available.

Regarding claim 19, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 19 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said off-line management procedure includes at least one of a file  
10 reorganization procedure ('957 col. 9 lines 1-6) and a file deletion procedure.

Regarding claim 20, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 20 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device utilizes an editing module ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 22) from said ancillary data module to effectively combine selected ones of said one or  
15 more ancillary data files with one or more images from said image data to thereby create a new composite image ('264 - col. 5 lines 22-24, col. 10 lines 30-36.)

Regarding claims 38-40 although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 18-20, respectively, as discussed above.

Regarding claim 41, Sarbadhikari teaches storing one or more ancillary data files  
20 in a data source (col. 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a computer (fig. 11 indicator 4; col. 11 lines 26-37), capturing said image data with an imaging device (col. 2 line 66 – col. 3 line 2; col. 5 line 55 – col. 6 line 26; col. 11 lines

Art Unit: 2612

26-37), transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device by using an ancillary data module (col. 4 lines 44-47; fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), and manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files (col. 6 lines 5-58; col. 10 lines 24-39),

5 said ancillary data files performing one or more on-line management procedures regarding said ancillary data files while an active communication path exists from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 44-47; col. 11 lines 26-37), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5

10 line 40.) However, Sarbadhikari does not teach any of the above steps occurring in conjunction with a computer in a distributed computer network. Additionally, although Sarbadhikari does teach the above program/programming/processor related steps, Sarbadhikari does not teach each step involving program instructions within a computer-readable medium.

15           Nevertheless, Steinberg is found to teach similar steps for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed (fig. 1 indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with

20 the computer as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create the steps for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image

Art Unit: 2612

data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer or data source.

Furthermore, Anderson is found to teach a computer readable medium comprising program instructions for a system that dynamically updates software

5 functions in an electronic imaging device (col. 13 lines 33-54; col. 14 lines 25-43.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transfer the steps as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which are effectuated by processors within programmed devices, and due to their processor based execution, are employed as programmed instructions, onto a computer readable medium

10 comprising program instructions as taught by Anderson, so that they may be easily transferred or from one computer in a distributed computer network to another computer in another distributed computer network, or so that they may be loaded as firmware onto a device to update or restore camera functionality without having to update or replace device hardware.

15

### ***Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C. Vieaux whose telephone number is 571-272-7318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2612


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Thai Q. Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned will be 703-872-9306 until September 15, 2005, and beginning July 15, 2005 will be 571-273-

5 8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you  
10 have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gary C. Vieaux  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2612

Gcv2

15



THAI TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER